DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 714 SP 028 367

AUTHOR Griffin, Gary A.
TITLE Teaching as a Profession: The Reform Agenda for Teacher Education.
INSTITUTION Rhode Island Univ., Kingston.
PUB DATE 15 Oct 86
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Robert Finkelstein Memorial Lecture (13th, Kingson, RI, October 15, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; Professional Recognition; *Program Improvement; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Effectiveness; Teaching Conditions

ABSTRACT

Three broad areas of recommendations in the teacher education reform agenda are addressed in this paper. These areas are preparation and continuing education of teachers, the conditions of teaching in the schools, and the requirements of teacher certification and licensure. The reform recommendations are aimed at: (1) the professional status of teachers; (2) the intellectual requirements of teacher education; (3) the relation of teacher education programs to ongoing elementary and secondary schools; (4) the continuing education of teachers; (5) standards, certification, and licensure of teachers; (6) the working conditions of teaching; (7) differentiated roles and rewards for teachers; and (8) the social composition of the teaching force. Each recommendation is discussed in the light of what is expected of teachers, what teachers expect, how the recommendation relates to the education of teachers, and how the recommendation can best be effected. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED276714

TEACHING AS A PROFESSION: THE REFORM AGENDA IN TEACHING EDUCATION

GARY A. GRIFFIN
University of Illinois at Chicago

The Thirteenth Annual
Robert Finkelstein Memorial Lecture
October 15, 1986

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. A. Griffin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

College of Human Science and Services
University of Rhode Island, Kingston 02881

SP 028 367

TEACHING AS A PROFESSION: THE REFORM AGENDA FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

GARY A. GRIFFIN
University of Illinois at Chicago

Prepared for the Thirteenth Annual Robert Finkelstein Memorial Lecture
The University of Rhode Island
October 15, 1986

TEACHING AS A PROFESSION: THE REFORM AGENDA FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

Introduction

My concern is with the education of teachers. I believe strongly that what teachers know, how they make their knowledge present to children and youth, and how they conceive of their important roles in our society have been and will continue to be central to social, economic, technological, and cultural progress in our country. And, I believe that never before in our shared history has the importance of teachers and teaching been so dramatically center stage as it is today. Not since the enormously powerful idea of universal public education was being debated in the United States has the role of who shall teach our children received so much attention by policy makers, the profession itself, and the general public.

Over the past five years we have witnessed the transformation of generalized complaints about the quality of schooling into calls for action. Further, these calls for action are rooted in a heretofore unique blend of policy initiatives, political haymaking, reconceptions of educational opportunity, and research-derived evidence of the need for change. We saw the publication of *A Nation At Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), a largely political statement that captured the imagination of large numbers of persons who had only paid minimal attention to schools and the people in them. Legislators in states and municipalities developed short- and long-range plans to improve educational opportunity (National Governors Association, 1986), ranging from more rigid assessments of educational progress through specifications of curricula to altering intellectual and practical requirements for teacher certification. We are currently awash with both substantive and polemical criticism of and recommendations for how higher education does or does not prepare young people for productive citizenship. We have read with interest the results of a number of scholarly inquiries into how education proceeds, from

Goodlad's *A Place Called School* (1983) to Sizer's *Horace's Compromise* (1984): The research community has discovered classrooms and schools, at last.

It is not surprising that the concern for educational quality has been reduced to a preoccupation with teachers, who they are and what they bring to teaching. Teachers are the central participants in our schools, they are the ones upon whom rest the enormous responsibility for creating a literate, responsible, and inventive public (The Holmes Group, 1986). They are the most public of educators. Upon them, many of us believe, rests a large part of the future of our nation.

This interest in schools and teachers comes at a time when our country will need, in a conservative estimate, 1.3 million new teachers during the next decade (Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986). At issue is who shall be the nation's teachers, how shall they be prepared, how shall they be viewed and treated in our society, how shall they be rewarded, and how shall they demonstrate their worth to the public? Naturally, these are not new questions. They have always been present in discussions and systematic study of our complex educational system. What is new is that the questions, and answers to them, are in the consciousness of policy makers, research scientists, political figures, the general public, and educators themselves. Those of us who are concerned with schools and teachers have a new set of powerful allies as we go about our business.

This coalition of interest is also characterized by our understanding that it is not enough to call for stricter standards for teacher certification, for increased rigor in teacher preparation, or the institutionalization of tests of teachers' intellectual abilities. We must attend to these intellectual and pedagogical issues, of course, but in order to bring about reforms related to improving the character of the teaching force we must also attend to how teachers are licensed, and how teachers are perceived and treated in schools (The Holmes Group, 1986).

The Teacher Education Reform Agenda

The three broad areas of recommendations in the teacher education reform agenda are preparation and continuing education of teachers, the conditions of teaching in schools, and the requirements of teacher certification and licensure. The reform recommendations are aimed at (1) the professional status of teachers, (2) the intellectual requirements of teacher education, (3) the relation of teacher education programs to ongoing elementary and secondary schools, (4) the continuing education of teachers, (5) standards, certification, and licensure of teachers, (6) the working conditions of teaching, (7) differentiated roles and rewards for teachers, and (8) the social composition of the teaching force.

The Professional Status of Teachers

Although teachers and, to a lesser extent, others in our society refer to teaching as a profession, that claim is open to serious question (Etzioni, 1969). Some of us believe that today's teachers are engaged in carrying out an occupation that has few of the characteristics of a profession. This belief is fostered in large part by the ways we prepare teachers and by the limitations that teachers face when they attempt to move out of an occupational status to a professional status.

Now, an occupation can be "trained" for. Training implies that there is one way to accomplish a task and that it is relatively easy to learn the requisite steps to lead to accomplishment. As long as we hold the view that teaching is the result of training, rather than serious and deep intellectual decision making activity, teaching will remain an occupation. And teachers will be symbolically and practically treated as paraprofessionals rather than as professionals. Paraprofessional training involves education that is efficiently taught, readily learned, easily observed, and quickly remediated (Griffin & Schlechty, 1983). That is a far cry from professional education. Professional education gives careful consideration to the need for the professional to have at his or her command the most relevant and recent knowledge about the tasks at hand and to select from that knowledge what the specific work situation demands.

The current teacher education reform movement is centered on the aim of increasing the professional status of teachers in today's society. In doing so, reformers recognize that teaching and teachers have come to be devalued in our culture, that their preparation is seen by some an insignificant matter, and that there are inherent conflicts in the ways teachers are viewed and the claims being made for how they should be viewed. We know that significant changes in what teachers know and how they are disposed to their work must be brought about to change an occupation, or job, into a profession. We believe, though, that only with major shifts in the way teachers are educated will come true professional status.

Professional status rests largely upon four fundamental conceptions of how one goes about his or her work (Case, Lanier, & Miskel, 1986). The first is related to the specialized knowledge that the professional possesses. Although it might be easy to teach a certified public accountant how to ask certain kinds of questions of children, it would be considerably more difficult to teach that same person when it is appropriate and what might result from asking certain kinds of questions of certain kinds of children in certain kinds of instructional situations. Being able to form the question according to specifications is a kind of technical professional skill; being able to select from a broad array of questioning possibilities just the right one is truly professional behavior.

Until recently, knowledge about teaching effectiveness was fragile at best. Teaching and teacher education abounded with proposals for action based upon opinion, nostrums, and unsubstantiated claims. During the past fifteen years, however, the research-supported knowledge that can set teacher behavior apart from that of "the person on the street" has developed into a robust intellectual support system for teaching (Good, 1981). We are much clearer about the potential for success of certain student-teacher interactions, grouping of students, use of text and other materials of instruction, how socioeconomic status of students is related to learning, what theoretical principles are most effective in guiding instruction, and so on.

In short, there is in place a substantial and still growing body of knowledge that can set the teacher apart from other adults. The teacher education reform movement acknowledges this in its drive to reconsider teaching as a profession.

A second conception of a profession is that its members' service is provided for the benefit of the public. Certainly, this hallmark of professional status has always been present for teachers. The difficulty has been the absence of a specialized knowledge base to differentiate teachers' public service from that of others.

A third conception of a profession is that its members have a commitment to inquiry, a devotion to contributing to knowledge about the work of the professional group. Unfortunately, teachers have not been expected to be skillful and systematic inquirers into their own practices. In fact, just the opposite has been true. Teachers have been expected to learn the lessons of others and to behave according to prescriptions for practice formulated by school officials, textbook publishers, and a plethora of so-called "experts." It is only recently that we have begun to act out the belief that the teacher is the person who is most appropriate, in terms of proximity as well as of concern, to engage in discovering and inventing knowledge about teaching.

In a number of experimental situations around the country, the concept of teacher as researcher has caught on and has been demonstrated to be a powerful way to both empower teachers as professionals as well as to raise their own estimates of their effectiveness (Tikunoff, Ward, & Griffin, 1981). This empowerment and rise in self-esteem contribute significantly to how schools and school systems are judged. It is clear from the research that a school with teachers who are reflective and analytic about teaching and schooling is a more effective school than one where teachers are treated and act like automatons (Griffin, 1986). Perhaps even more important, the consequence of teacher involvement in knowledge production has been an increase in specialized knowledge and skill.

The last conception of teaching as a profession, and a primary preoccupation of teacher education reform, is that a profession is in the best sense a collegium, a community of peers with control over who should become members of the community, what standards members must meet for entrance and continued participation, and what circumstances would bar or sever membership. Currently, teachers have no control over who should become their peers. That control is vested in state departments of education and schools and colleges of education. (Generally speaking, the state approves a program of study proposed by higher education, the prospective teacher moves through such a program with success, the officers of the college or university recommend certification, and the state recognizes the person as a teacher.)

What reformers see as wrong with this situation is that teachers in yet another instance are controlled from without. They have little or no vested interest in exercising their will about incompetence because it is not likely to result in anything of consequence. And there are precious few rewards for upholding standards of excellence in a situation where the guiding principle appears to be, "a teacher is a teacher is a teacher" (Lieberman, 1984).

Many of us believe that teachers have earned the right to a voice in the organization and membership of their colleagues and that a primary role in setting standards for the collectivity should be that of teachers. This right, of course, depends upon the *combination* of properties of a profession. Teachers must demonstrate their mastery of the special knowledge that defines teaching, they must become more systematically reflective about teaching and schooling, and they must demonstrate powerfully their commitment to and accomplishment of contributing to the public good. This amalgam of possibilities will support raising the status of teaching to that of a profession and, many of us believe, will contribute to the public's willingness to invest more in teachers and, in the end, attract to teaching persons of intellectual accomplishment, personal compassion, and pedagogical effectiveness.

When one considers what one must know to be a professional teacher, one must come to grips with the intellectual requirements of teaching.

The Intellectual Requirements of Teaching

The debate about what one must know and be able to do and to be called a teacher has a formidable history and a turbulent present. At one time, it was believed that to be a grade school graduate was sufficient. As the education level of our population increased, so did the expectations that teachers would have equivalent educational backgrounds. Eventually, higher education institutions were created to prepare teachers (the normal schools of yesterday) and eventually the education of teachers was assumed as part of the mission of comprehensive universities. Today, of course, schools and colleges of education are taken for granted in most universities.

The current views of the intellectual requirements of teaching can be stereotyped as "not much, a subject matter bachelor's degree will do," to "a great deal, a strong liberal arts and sciences experience and a rigorous program of professional studies." The teacher education reform movement (as opposed to reforms centered on meeting demands for large numbers of new teachers) takes the latter view.

Teachers do more than ask questions, pass out textbooks, chastise or praise students, or correct homework. They embody the culture and make it present in human form to their students. They connect students' experiences to historical and future-oriented conditions and events. They transmit societal norms and expectations. They model intellectual style and provide intellectual leadership. They demonstrate the consequences and utlility of learning. They contribute to knowledge.

These statements, if one accepts them as expectations for what teachers should be and do, lead to the conclusion that teachers must have a strong grounding in the artifacts of the culture, a deep understanding of the life of the mind, and a commitment to learning that is demonstrated by

accomplishment in learning (Greene, 1984). Many of us believe that these expectations cannot be met by squeezing together into a baccalaureate program both liberal arts and sciences and professional education. We believe that prospective teachers should have a solid undergraduate education, with a major in a school subject, prior to engaging in professional studies. If we expect teachers to work with young people toward accomplishment in learning, it is important for those teachers to demonstrate their own accomplishment in learning and understand how it comes about.

This, by the way, is the single most controversial plank in the reform platform. The conventions of preparing teachers in fits and starts, with a relative absence of intellectual rigor, and with low expectations for intellectual investment have become the standards. Many of my teacher education colleagues across the country proclaim their beliefs that teacher education should attend more seriously to teachers' intellectual lives but cannot equate that belief with a reconsideration of how one becomes a teacher. The four-year bachelor's degree simply does not provide enough room for accommodating the need for serious study of the arts and sciences and equally serious involvement in learning to teach. I believe we need new standards for teacher education, ones that can withstand the scrutiny of the academy in general and that can earn the respect and rewards of the society at large.

An interesting aspect of the reform movement is its attention to the nature and quality of undergraduate liberal arts and sciences programs of study (Holmes Group, 1986). It is not enough to continue business as usual for undergraduates, business characterized by what has been called a cafeteria approach to learning (a bit of physical science here, a bit of social science here, a bit of humanties there, and so on) and which is typically taught in ways that are, at best, lacking in inventiveness, sound pedagogy, or dependence upon principles of learning. We who care about the education of teachers naturally also care about the nature of that education, whether it is provided by our immediate circle of scholars or by others in our colleges and universities.

Conventional practice has prospective teachers taking a small portion of their undergraduate program in professional studies. Although the stereotype is that teacher education students attend exclusively to educational issues, such is not the case. In particular, students preparing to teach in secondary schools may have only three or four courses in educational issues out of four years of study. Even this limited exposure to what it means to learn to teach cuts into opportunities to understand a subject well and to understand the relation of that subject to our shared history, our current events, and our unpredictable future.

The reform agenda suggests that study of professional education be delayed, with the exception of some familiarization opportunities, until after completion of an undergraduate degree or its equivalent. In part, this suggestion is political in nature in that it reflects the belief that professional status is earned and awarded partly by the investment that the professional makes in his or her education (Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986). There is considerable evidence that the public at large views a post-baccalaureate professional education with more favor and, because of that favored position, will be more willing to affix higher prices to services provided.

A more substantive argument for a yearlong investment in professional education is based upon two arguments. The first is the complexity of teaching as professional activity (Zumwalt, 1986). Although there are those who believe that teaching is a relatively straightforward and linear process, this is simply not the case. Teachers must be able to orchestrate with appropriate rhythm and tone a number of interacting variables. They must be able to convince students to cooperate in classrooms. They must be able to plan for student groups that are almost always characterized by wide variations in ability and willingness to learn. They must have the intellectual tools to select from an array of options for teaching that they have learned about and how to use. They must know the norms and regularities of schooling. They must understand the reasons for and the techniques to diagnose and prescribe learning opportunities. They must

understand the school's relation to the family and the community and be able to coordinate the varying expectations that students and parents have for classroom work. And they must know about and do these things in an environment that is best characterized by its uncertainty. In contrast to the production of widgets, the stamping of a piece of metal using a template, or stuffing envelopes, the teacher must be an executive decision maker, someone who is in command of the teaching-learning situation and whose leadership results in demonstrable learning by students.

A second argument for systematic and deep involvement with professional education is the advance in knowledge mentioned earlier (Good & Weinstein, 1986). This extension of the investment teacher candidates make in their education is not just to make more room to do more of the same. I think it fair to say that many of the critics of teacher education are partly correct. There is a lot of mindlessness in many teacher education programs. There is a persistence in learning "how to." There is repetition and overlap. But, there is a much more robust body of knowledge about teaching that should be mastered by prospective teachers than most teacher education programs include in their programs of study. It is this body of content that can consume a year or several years of serious study.

Knowledge comes in many forms. We have research knowledge, theoretical knowledge, propositional knowledge, and craft knowledge. Each has a place in the teacher education curriculum but there are few programs that demonstrate this. Research tells us that most teacher education programs depend mostly upon craft knowledge and ignore research knowledge (Griffin, 1986). Theoretical knowledge is given some short shrift but its utility for understanding and doing teaching is usually not made explicit.

The primary void in teacher education programs, for me, is the relative absence of ongoing and systematic opportunities to learn how to use what is learned, how to make selections from a repertoire of options for teaching, how to plan for and think about how knowledge is used. It is

this layer of understanding that distinguishes the truly effective professional teacher from the technically adequate teacher. The development and refinement of this understanding requires substantially more time and resource allocation than we typically provide to prospective teachers.

A central issue for teacher education programs is where teacher education takes place. Currently, it takes place in a number of settings in the college or university *and* in public and private elementary and secondary schools. The relationship between higher education institutions and schools is one that is of major importance to the teacher education reform agenda.

Strengthening Relationships with and Impact upon Ongoing Elementary and Secondary Schools

Teacher education is largely, although certainly not entirely, affected by the classrooms in which prospective teachers learn to teach. These classrooms are visited by teacher education students as means to learn how teaching is carried forward, and, eventually, the students practice their newly developed teaching skills under the direction of teachers in the settings. The effectiveness of this somewhat intermittent and short-term immersion in life in classrooms is open to question on a variety of fronts.

In terms of time spent in classrooms, because of the conventional joining together of a liberal arts and sciences education with professional studies, there is not a considerable investment of time and careful thought by students or by faculty in higher education. There is simply too much to squeeze into a bachelor's degree program to require more than modest involvement in the situations where what is being learned will be implemented.

Because of the too-often tenuous link between what the university faculty believe to be so and what elementary and secondary teachers believe to be so, there is very little shared understanding (Lanier, 1983). In fact, it is common to hear teachers who are working with student teachers declare that they must "start from scratch" and help the candidate teacher "unlearn" all that "theory" that was taught at the university. Research on student teaching is clear that this, indeed, is what occurs: Student teachers enter the student teaching situation carrying the values

and intellectual orientations of the university and leave it carrying the values and orientations of the (usually) public school (Griffin et al., 1983).

This shift in views about what teaching is and should be is, of course, extraordinarily inefficient and troublesome for teacher educators and prospective teachers. More important, though, is that in a time when there is general criticism of schools and the teachers in them, we continue to engage in practices whereby new teachers adopt the habits of mind and practice that, in effect, are the objects of severe criticism.

Now, it is important to acknowledge that teachers in schools are often as perceptive and knowledgeable about their work as university professors. Too frequently, however, teacher education students are placed with teachers who demonstrate more willingness to receive them than they demonstrate the ability to work effectively with them. We sometimes confuse the issue by assuming that a teacher who works very well with third-graders will also be able to teach another adult how to do that work. That equation is simply not true.

Further, elementary and secondary schools typically do not give attention to new knowledge, are not centers of inquiry, do not contribute to or show commitment to professional norms, and do not promote the concept of community among teachers and other educators. Teaching has been characterized as a "lonely" profession (Sarason, 1974). Although it is difficult to conceive of being lonely in the company of twenty-five or thirty children, it is easy to imagine the isolation one would feel if that were one's only human companionship for the largest part of the work day. Opportunities for adults in schools to interact systematically and thoroughly over issues of mutual importance are simply not part of most schools' cultures.

We need to conceive of institutional conditions that will contribute both to school improvement and effectiveness and to the creation of settings where teacher candidates can learn the best of practices. We need to develop relationships whereby the university can learn from the school people and the school people can learn from the university persons. This re-creation of

institutional arrangements is very difficult. The negotiations at intellectual and organizational/procedural levels are time-consuming, often painful, and energy-draining. But the consequences of such re-creation are of potentially great benefit.

Imagine some of the benefits for schools generally and teacher education students particularly. The higher education faculty have a ready environment to test out new ideas, develop research ideas, and engage in systematic developmental tasks. School faculty are linked to recent technical and theoretical knowledge. School faculty contribute to programs of instruction on the university campus, perhaps as clinical professors. Schools become centers of inquiry, places where the adults in the setting collaborate around issues of persistent and central importance to teaching and schooling. Schools become models of excellence, places where others in a system or a region or a state can come to learn from their peers and transfer that knowledge to their own workplaces. Prospective teachers can learn from true master teachers and the master teachers can be helped to understand the most effective ways to work with adults. These schools can be the places where some new teachers begin their autonomous professional practice. And so on.

What is being called for is nothing less than the demolition of the intellectual, practical, and organizational boundaries that currently prevent institutions with like concerns and interests from acting together for school improvement and effective teacher education. In place of these boundaries will be constructed a set of conduits that join schools and universities toward mutually desired ends.

The concern with these schools as particular examples raises the important reform agenda item of the continuing education of teachers.

The Continuing Education of Teachers

The reason that professionals engage in systematic inquiry is to ensure that their knowledge is recent and that their ability to use that knowledge is kept sharply honed. It is commonly

accepted that physicians and lawyers are constantly learning their craft, even the term "practicing medicine" assumes that being a physician is in reality the continuous process of becoming a physician.

The current state of continuing education by and for teachers is far from systematic and cumulative (Ward, 1986). It is characterized by low expectations, again suggesting that teaching is a job rather than a career, an occupation rather than a profession. Teachers are taught how to do something, how to engage in technique. The current rage of "packages" for teachers to learn the five principles that justify ten behaviors that result in four outcomes is symptomatic of a deep and enduring problem: The undervaluing of the intellectual requirements of teaching. There is little investment by states and school districts in providing richer and more meaningful continuing education opportunities available to teachers. There are few truly collaborative arrangements between universities and schools that would support a sustained effort of continuing education. And, if there weren't enough evidence to testify to the "flatness" of teaching already, there is an obvious lack of distinction made among the continuing education needs, for example, of new teachers, teachers in their fifth or sixth year of practice, and long-term veterans of teaching. Again, this time using continuing education as the framework, we hear the refrain, "a teacher is a teacher is a teacher."

For teaching to become a career, it is necessary for us to think carefully about how teachers change over time, how they come to become more expert, how they assume more responsibility for their own and others' practice, how they come to be inquirers rather than followers of directions, and how they conceive of themselves as learning professionals. We cannot come to grips with resolutions of these issues as long as we think of teaching as something that most everyone does in much the same way, no matter how many years have been devoted to the tasks. Teaching will remain a job and resist becoming a career if we continue to believe that teaching is something that is learned once and for all and only a bit of tinkering around the edges of technique is expected as the years go by.

Again, the research on teacher growth and change is clear: Teachers in effective schools testify that they never truly learn to teach, it is a continuous process of becoming (Rosenholtz, 1986). This is in stark contrast to ineffective schools where the teachers say it takes about two years to learn to teach or mediocre schools where teachers say it takes about five years. Clearly, the mindset toward and the engagement with learning that teachers carry with them is an important ingredient in school effectiveness.

We must break the pattern that assumes that teachers need or desire little continuous professional education, or that the education they do get is best delivered exclusively or largely at the level of sharpening technique. Our best teacher colleagues have demonstrated the importance of continuity of learning, of persistent and ever-more-sharply refined inquiry skills, of broadened and deepened knowledge of both subject matter and pedagogy, and of increased sensitivity to the world around them. We must increase our investment in teacher education and conceive of it as continuous and longterm, rather than sporadic and lodged exclusively in a baccalaureate program of study.

Given the belief that teaching can become a professional career and believing that the knowledge bases and institutional capacities are present to support that condition, it is necessary to rethink how we go about deciding that someone is, indeed, a teacher.

Standards, Certification, and Licensure of Teachers

Although it may appear to be an outrageous statement, I claim that there never has been a teacher shortage in the United States. As long as there is a state or municipal licensing agency that can say, "You're a teacher," a shortage cannot exist. And this is exactly what we have done. We have allowed persons without qualifications to move into classroom authority positions because we needed adults there, not because they have the necessary intellectual and pedagogical background. We then allow these persons to remain in the teaching force, changing their status from "emergency" to "permanent." Yes, we have had a shortage of *qualified* teachers. But in

times of supply-demand inequality we tend to forget what qualifications are desirable or necessary and substitute minimal standards so that the void is filled, however problemmatically.

We must stop this "back door" certification. Yes, we may find ourselves again soon in the position of not having available qualified teachers and, yes, we may have to resort to filling teaching positions with persons who, in reality, are not teachers. But we must acknowledge this stopgap measure and use the resources at hand to correct the conditions.

We must develop entry requirements in our teacher education programs that systematically deprive unqualified individuals from participating, graduating, and becoming certified. We must develop exit standards that do not just guarantee that some mindless minimum standard has been met but that the teacher education graduate has at his or her command the knowledge, skill, and disposition that lead us to expect that he or she will continue on the path toward excellence.

There are various proposals for how to do this. One is the construction of assessment procedures to be used by teacher education institutions independent of whether or not state agencies require them. Another is for states to develop testing systems. (This is already in place in a number of states but the requirements of the testing programs are generally at the level of ensuring that new and/or experienced teachers are minimally verbally and numerically literate.) Another is the institution of a national standards board, a body that would develop assessment procedures and whose work would be controlled and directed largely by expert teachers (Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986). Another is the requirement that teacher certification be delayed until the successful completion of a first year of teaching.

Whatever the form that demonstration of competence takes, it is imperative that we conceive of licensure as a guarantee of best and safest practice, as a fair and just means to demonstrate that guarantee, and as a way to promote teaching excellence rather than resting at the level of "just good enough." And, if we reach the point where we must accept into the classrooms of our children persons who have not earned the guarantee, we must admit to rather than try to cover up with false labels the fact that we have not been able to attract qualified persons to our schools.

This, then, raises the issues of the conditions of schools that attract the best teachers and those conditions that cause people to reject teaching as an option or to leave it after a short term of service.

The Conditions of Teaching

There was a time when gifted minorities and women saw schoolteaching as one of a very few occupational outlets for their intelligence, creativity, and social commitment. Many of us still live with the memories and the effects of our interactions with these outstanding teachers. Now, however, our society has opened additional professional doors to their contemporary counterparts. The law, medicine, business, industry are all avenues for social and economic advancement, no matter one's gender, skin color, or ethnicity.

What must be accomplished to attract the so-called "best and the brightest" to teaching? Although the dominant argument centers on salary, particularly in our increasingly materialistic society, that is only a partial answer to the question. Of course, teachers who have invested in their preparation, who engage in serious inquiry about their work and its effects on children and youth, and who contribute significantly to the social good deserve to be rewarded well. But, there are other worklife conditions that must be changed before we have the teaching force we need so much as we move into the 21st century.

If we truly want professional teachers, and the truth of that desire will be tested in the coming decade, we must provide schools in which these teachers can exercise their professional knowledge and skill. In the same way that we believe that teachers should not be subjected to learning about teaching at the level of technique and paraprofessionalism, they should not be expected only to demonstrate technique and paraprofessionalism. Teaching is a highly complex and interactive endeavor, requiring the exercise of judgement and the demonstration of skill that reflects that judgement. Teachers must regain some of the autonomy that has been lost in the last decade's move toward behavioral accountability, accountability rooted in going by the

numbers. Schools must be places where teachers can be decision makers and where teacher decision making is central to how schools go about their business.

I do not mean to suggest that the new breed of teachers will not need guidance, technical and conceptual help, or opportunities to make mistakes. Of course, there will always be a need for support for teaching. But the nature of that support for professional teachers is not telling them what to do, when, and for how long, but providing an environment where the necessary knowledge is available and where the context is supportive of using that knowledge (Griffin & Barnes, 1984). It is oxymoronic to assume that tomorrow's teachers will be among the best educated we have ever seen and then subject them to typical school conditions, conditions that require subservience and responsiveness rather than experimentation and collaboration among peers.

Teachers, at least the teachers I am talking about, are not ones who value being the object of others' decisions. They want and deserve opportunities to be central participants in decisions that affect themselves, their colleagues, and their clients and patrons. Teachers bring extraordinary intellectual and experiential resources to the resolution of school issues and problems. To deny them the opportunity to use those resources is to diminish their worth as individual professionals and as colleagues. And, importantly, when that denial and diminishment are present in schools, a large number of the best of our teachers leave to search for opportunities where their self-esteem and their knowledge are valued (Schlechty & Joslin, 1984).

A very nontrivial issue when considering teachers as professionals is the amount of time and energy that are devoted to nonteaching school functions. If a teacher is a professional, as most public rhetoric claims, why is he or she expected to collect lunch money, fill out endless forms, monitor playground or lunchroom behavior, listen to endless repetitions of administrivia in faculty meetings, and so on? Surely, teachers and society have not invested so much just to be certain that the milk money collection of pennies, nickels, and dimes is accurate. Teachers are prepared to teach. We must let them teach.

And teaching must take place where there are human and material amenities. These amenities support the work of teaching. Why must teachers resort to using a school office telephone rather than one that is available in their classrooms? (For that matter, why haven't we considered seriously the telephone as an instructional tool, a way for children and the teacher to connect to the world outside the school?) Why do teachers do so much of their own clerical work, typing and duplicating and collating? Why is there not an investment in human and technological support for teachers?

My answer to these questions is blunt: We force teachers into nonteaching roles and functions because we do not value teaching enough or understand it sufficiently to require that it be supported adequately. We persist in acting out a view of teaching that developed when teachers were not well-educated, when schooling was seen as a means to develop a barely literate society, when the world was simpler, and when schools were not seen as the social mechanism to respond to our cultural needs.

Times and conditions have changed but our view of teaching has not. It is time to bring our understanding of the role of teaching and schooling into some compatibility with our understanding of the world we share. Only then will we attract the teachers we say we want.

If and when we attract the teachers we say we want, how can we ensure that they will enter a professional career?

Differentiated Roles, Responsibilities and Rewards for Teachers

As I noted earlier, a principal difference between this reform agenda and prior ones is the attention paid to the interaction of improved teacher education, revised certification, and altered conditions of teaching. A substantial change in business as usual is envisioned for the teachers I have been describing in this paper. Instead of entering a workforce where everyone who is called "teacher" is treated pretty much like everyone else with that title, the current reforms recommend that teaching be treated seriously as a career.

The career concept for teachers suggests that there be stages in a teacher's professional education, stages that widen and deepen the teacher's knowledge and skill, leading eventually to the use of that knowledge and skill outside the conventional classroom. The attention to the teacher as a school leader is directly related to differentiated roles and responsibilities.

The issue of teaching as a career raises interesting and important questions about what should or can be expected of teachers. Currently, it is naive to suggest that teachers extend their authority, prolong their education, and devote more time to their work unless there is a commensurate change in rewards. Put another way, why should teachers or any other professional devote additional time and energy to their work without receiving greater compensation?

The reform agenda provides for teacher choice in making career decisions, much as other professions do. We know for a fact that many teachers are very satisfied with the flexibility of a nine or ten month contract, with six or seven hour school days, and the typical numbers of holidays. This flexibility allows some teachers to raise families, others to engage in creative activities, and still others to pursue avocational interests. Many teachers, in reality, choose teaching for these features of the work. And, it is unlikely that this condition will change. Therefore, the reform agenda provides for teachers to prepare themselves and continue their education largely to promote their effectiveness in relatively conventional roles as autonomous classroom leaders.

But what about those teachers who wish to exert greater influence upon schools? Currently, there are few provisions for these teachers, in terms of in-place career ladders based upon increased responsibility (as opposed to merit pay increases). The reform agenda suggests that some teachers can develop specialized knowledge and skill that serve a school function. For example, some teachers may choose to become specialists in curriculum development and work with their colleagues on improved educational offerings in the school (Holmes Group, 1986).

Others may wish to develop their ability to provide advice and counsel about tests and measurement, thereby enriching the intellectual environment of the school. Others may wish to become expert in working with other adults, the large number of new teachers we are expecting to enter schools in the coming decade make up a case in point, and take a large part of the responsibility for providing effective teacher education programs that are school-based. And so on.

The point to be made is that the reform agenda considers seriously the relationships between (l) school functions that are necessary for school effectiveness and (2) distributing the expertise to perform those functions among the teaching staff. We know that schools need a variety of bodies of knowledge and skill in order to be effective and we also know that the current pattern of expecting a school principal to deliver all of the necessary knowledge and skill is unrealistic (Purkey & Smith, 1983). By providing teachers with the choice of either continuing to be a classroom leader or a classroom leader *and* a school leader, we can develop communities of teachers who have made choices and among whom we can find persons to contribute significantly to school improvement work.

Naturally, the teacher who provides leadership to his or her colleagues will be paid more for this extended preparation for the role and for the additional energies that are required by it. At the same time, the school can call upon these specialist teachers to make more contributions to the school culture just because they are paid more as well as because they have demonstrated that they have invested in developing extraordinary professional expertise.

Whether these specialist teachers are called "lead teachers" or "career professional teachers," using the language of two of the reform groups, the concept is a considered blend of providing teachers with choices as to the shape of their careers and acknowledging what schools need in the form of intellectual resources to become effective.

The Social Composition of
The Teaching Force

It must be acknowledged that a major concern of the teacher education reformers is the declining numbers of minority persons preparing for teaching. At the same time that the country's student population includes greater number of minority members, the teaching force is becoming characterized as largely white. This dilemma raises questions about the desirability of students not seeing as role models persons of their own race or color, the barriers that minority persons still face in gaining access to higher education, the perceived deterioration of elementary and secondary schools in preparing minority students for college, and the power of schoolteaching to attract capable minority persons at a time when other career options are increasingly open to them.

The reform agenda for teacher education provides the possibility of a greater lure to capable minority members in its attention to teaching as a career and greater rewards for engaging in that career. But, it also promises to extend the investment necessary to gain entry to the career. Clearly, these two conditions are in conflict for many minority citizens. Although teaching as a career may soon be able to compete for able minority college students, in terms of professional status, for example, many of those students may be unable to locate sufficient resources to prepare them for entry into teaching.

There must be a coordinated investment in enlarging the a pool of qualified minority teachers, an investment with partners from national and local government, with commitment and resources from higher education, and with contributions from business, industry, and philanthropic agencies. Indeed, it would be enormously distressing to turn teaching, a traditional avenue toward realizing social and economic mainstream life for minorities, into an exclusionary profession, one that denies entry because of the life circumstances of potential candidates.

Conclusion

This, then, is an overview of the teacher education reform agenda, *circa* 1986. It is complex, it is certainly flawed in some of its particulars, it is in need of continued serious discussion and debate. But, while I recognize the difficulties associated with changing significantly any large-scale social enterprise, and teaching and schooling certainly are large-scale in this country, I also believe that, perhaps for the first time in our shared history, we have the wit and the will to move ahead.

Progress will depend, in large measure, upon a blend of heretofore disparate views, a coming together of often antagonistic institutions and agencies, a willingness to be less politically intractible, and a commitment to engaging in common cause for the good of the nation and its people. For many of us, the time to make major changes in the education of teachers and in the ways teachers serve the society is now. If we do not act, if we allow self interests or lack of will to interfere with seizing the extraordinary opportunities and challenges that face us, we will have to live with the consequences for generations. That simply will not do. Our nation deserves great teachers. We know a good deal about how great teachers come to be. And great teachers deserve to be treated with dignity, offered choices within a career structure, and rewarded well. Let's get on with it.

References

Case, C., Lanier, J., & Miskel, C. (1986). The Holmes Group Report: Impetus for gaining professional status for teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(4), 36-43.

Etzioni, A. (1969). *The semi-professions and their organization: Teachers, nurses, social workers.* New York: The Free Press.

Good, T. (1981). *Classroom research: What we know and what we need to know.* Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin: The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Good, T. & Weinstein, R. (1986). Teacher expectations: A framework for exploring classrooms. In Zumwalt, K. K. (Ed.), *Improving teaching.* Alexandria, VA: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, (pp. 63-86).

Goodlad, J. (1983). *A place called school.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Greene, M. (1984). How do we think about our craft? *Teachers College Record, 86*(1), 55-67.

Griffin, G. (1986). Clinical teacher education. In Hoffman, J. & Edwards, S. (Eds.), *Reality and reform in clinical teacher education.* New York: Random House, (pp. 1-24).

Griffin, G. (1986). Issues in student teaching: A review. In Raths, J. & Katz, L. (Eds.), *Advances in teacher education: Volume 2.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation, (pp. 239-273).

Griffin, G. & Barnes, S. (1984). School change: A craft-derived and research-based strategy. *Teachers College Record, 86*(1), 103-123.

Griffin, G., Barnes, S., Hughes, R., O'Neal, S., Edwards, S., & Defino, M. (1983). *Clinical preservice teacher education: Final report of a descriptive study.* (Report No. 9025). Austin, TX: University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Griffin, G. & Schlechty, P. (1983). *Recommendations regarding certification of teachers.* Unpublished manuscript. Paper prepared for the Mississippi State Department of Education.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers.* Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Lanier, J. (1983). Tensions in teaching teachers the skills of pedagogy. In Griffin, G. (Ed.), *Staff development: 82nd yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education,* (pp. 118-153).

Lieberman, A. (1984). School improvement: Research, craft, and concept. *Teachers College Record, 86*(1), 1-3.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* Washington, DC: United States Department of Education.

National Governors' Association. (1986). *Time for results: The governor's 1991 report on education.* Washington, DC: National Governor's Association.

Purkey, S. & Smith, M. (1983). Effective schools: A review. *The Elementary School Journal, 83*(4), 427-452.

Rosenholtz, S. (1986). *Workplace conditions of teacher quality and commitment: Implications for the design of teacher induction programs.* Paper presented at the Initial Year of Teaching Conference, Chicago, IL.

Sarason, S. (1974). *The culture of the school and the problem of change.* New York: Allyn and Bacon.

Schlechty, P. & Joslin, A. (1984). Images of schools. *Teachers College Record, 86*(1), 156-170.

Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century.* Hyattsville, MD: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Tikunoff, W., Ward, B., & Griffin, G. (1981). Interactive research and development as a form of professional growth. In K. Howey, R. Bents, and D. Corrigan (Eds.), *School-focused inservice.* Reston, VA: Association for Teacher Educators, (pp. 86-93).

Ward, B. (1986). Clinical teacher education and professional teacher development. In Hoffman, J. & Edwards, S. (Eds.), *Reality and reform in clinical teacher education.* New York: Random House, (pp. 65-87).

Zumwalt, K. K. (Ed.). (1986). *Improving teaching.* 1986 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Alexandria, VA: The Association.